

## REMARKS

The present response to the Office Action dated August 24, 2004 includes the substance to the Telephone Interview conducted with the Examiner on July 17, 2004 in compliance with MPEP Section 713.04.

Attention is drawn to the Examiner that a formal reply to the previous Office Action dated July 13, 2004 was already filed on August 19, 2004.

In the course of the Telephone Interview, the Applicants' representative made the Examiner aware that the rejection of Claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, amounting to a gap between the steps was to be corrected by the Applicants amending Claims 13 and 14.

Applicants explained to the Examiner that these omissions were not the result of negligence, but rather the result of e-filing the present application using PASAT. PASAT is known to contain (software) bugs, wherein on occasion the presence of a colon induces the system to eliminate the word immediately following the colon.

Applicants' representative also discussed the rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Sakakibara et al (U.S.P. No. 5,952,155).


Reasons for the traversing the above rejection were provided to the Examiner, with Applicants' representative explaining that AAPA in combination with Sakakibara fails to teach an ion source having a plate-like object with a plurality of ion ejection holes that creates a uniform intensity distribution, generating a uniform orientation of liquid crystal molecules on the surface of the thin film. By placing the patterns of micro-apertures directly on the mask and not in the plate-like object in the ion source, AAPA in combination with Sakakibara teaches away from what the Applicants deemed to be their invention.

Applicants' representative submitted that in order to further distinguish independent claims 1 and 7 from AAPA in combination with Sakakibara et al, Claims 1 and 7 were to be amended to include the limitations recited, respectively, in Claims 5 and 11.

The Examiner suggested that a formal written response to the Office Action be submitted to reflect the proposed arguments and amendment. This was done by filing a response to the Office Action on August 19, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

NOBUO OKAZAKI ET AL.

By:   
H. Daniel Schnurmann, Agent  
Registration No. 35,791  
Tel. No. (845) 894 2481